



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,494	10/27/2003	Robert P. Loce	D/98542D1	4288

7590 06/10/2005

Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20050511

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,494

Applicant(s)

LOCE ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M. Brinich

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-3 & 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bollman.

Re claims 1-3, Bollman discloses (column 5, line 54 - column 6, line 26) a digital image processing system in which a document image is received and edges of shapes are manipulated in such a way that they are selectively softened via dilation (processing via the 6x6 matrix described at column 6, line 3).

Re claim 9, the edge softening process uses a blurring (i.e. spatial low-pass) convolution filter (column 5, lines 60-61).

Re claim 10, look-up tables values are used in the edge softening process (column 5, lines 65-66).

Re claims 11-14, the edge softening process inherently modifies the values of at least some pixels, some to higher values (e.g. the white pixels at the right-hand side of the "soft edge" of Figure 4B) and some to lower values (e.g. the dark pixels at the left-hand side of the "soft edge" of Figure 4B), creating a gradient (of increasing density of dark pixels from left to right in the "soft edge" of Figure 4B).

Art Unit: 2624

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4-8 & 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Claims 16-24 are allowed.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 4 & 16 (and dependent claims 5-8 & 17-19), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited trapping and tagging operations in conjunction with the claimed selective edge softening arrangement.

Re claims 15 & 20 (and dependent claims 21-22), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited selective dilation, isolation, halftoning, and XOR operations in conjunction with the claimed selective edge softening arrangement.

Re claims 23 & 24, the art of record does not teach the recited arrangement for selective softening of edges relative to the fast and slow scan directions.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2624

Re claims 1-3 & 9-14, in response to applicant's argument (1/10/05 Response: page 8, line 14 - page 9, line 13) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. selective dilation limited to "dilation of those shape edges which are only perpendicular to the fast scan direction, or in the alternative only perpendicular to the slow scan direction of an image marking process"). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The recitation of "selective dilation" in the claim language, not further specified, is readable upon the Bollman selective processing of an original pixel via a larger (in this case, 6x6 array) matrix.

Re claims 4-8 & 15, Applicant argues (1/10/05 Response: page 9, lines 20-22) that these claims depend from other allowable claims (i.e. these claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 3).

This argument has been addressed above.

Art Unit: 2624

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.


Art Unit: 2624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

smb 
May 13, 2005



THOMAS D.
~~LEE~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER